

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations  
and is not a part of the Official Record

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,  
please do not report the images to the  
Image Problem Mailbox.**



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/712,930	11/16/2000	Nancy Berger	BS00-118	3156
28970	7590	06/07/2004	EXAMINER	
SHAW PITTMAN IP GROUP 1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD SUITE 1300 MCLEAN, VA 22102			AVELLINO, JOSEPH E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2143	

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/712,930

Applicant(s)

BERGER ET AL.

Examiner

Joseph E. Avellino

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 November 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 and 20-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 19 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-33 are presented for examination with claims 1, 16, 22, 26, and 30 being independent.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

2. Claim 19 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 5, 6, 9, 14, 16, 20, 22, 23, 25-27, 29-31, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fang et al. (USPN 6,243,816) (hereinafter Fang).

Art Unit: 2143

4. Referring to claim 1, Fang discloses a system for integrated processing of information from a plurality of data systems, the system comprising:

- a first network connection (1, 3), the first network connection adapted to receive information sent from a terminal over a first network and also adapted to received information set to the terminal (Figure 3);

- a plurality of data system connections 6, each data system connection of the plurality of data system connections adapted to receive information sent to a respective data system of the plurality of data systems (Figure 3);

- a server coupled to the first network connection and the plurality of data system connections, the server including:

- a processor (an inherent feature of any machine running the operating systems described in col. 4, lines 7-14);

- a memory coupled to the processor, the memory including a plurality of data system instructions objects (i.e. id/password combinations), wherein each data system instructions object of the plurality of data system instructions objects corresponds to a respective data system of the plurality of data systems, and wherein each data system instructions object manages communications between the terminal and the respective data system of the plurality of data systems (i.e. it is managed by the object since if the object does not approve of the connection to the data system, it is not allowed (e.g. abstract; Figure 6 and pertinent portions of the disclosure).

Art Unit: 2143

5. Referring to claim 5, Fang discloses the memory includes a user profile (i.e. a login coordinator; Figure 5), wherein the user profile instructions object:

receives login information of a user from the terminal (Figure 3; col. 6, lines 42-45); and

determines the access rights of the user for each respective data system of the plurality of data systems (col. 6, lines 42-49).

6. Referring to claim 6, Fang discloses the plurality of data systems instructions objects are object-oriented software modules (the Office takes the term "object-oriented" to mean "able to organize the software modules in a hierarchal manner") (Figure 10 and pertinent portions of the disclosure).

7. Referring to claim 9, Fang discloses the first network connection is a WAN port (i.e. Internet) (col. 12, lines 44-45).

8. Referring to claim 14, Fang discloses each data system being coupled to the server via a respective data system connection of the plurality of data system connections (Figure 3).

9. Claims 16, 20, 22, 23, 25-27, 29-31, and 33 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above. Furthermore Fang discloses sending the data system access rights information to a terminal based at least in part on the determined set of data systems of

the plurality of data systems to which the user has access (Figure 6 and related portions of the disclosure).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 2, 4, 15, 17, 24, 28, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fang in view of Star (US Pre-Grant Pub. 2002/0062270).

12. Referring to claim 2, Fang discloses the invention substantively as described in claim 1. Fang furthermore discloses the plurality of data system connections includes a

Art Unit: 2143

first data system connection and a second data system connection, and the plurality of data system instructions objects include a first data system instructions object and a second data systems instructions object, wherein the first data systems instructions object is different from the second data systems instructions object (Figure 5 and related portions of the disclosure). Fang does not specifically state that the first data system connection and the second data system connection are selected from the group consisting of a credit services system connection, an inventory services system connection, a customer services system connection, and an activations system connection and the plurality of data system instructions objects are selected from the group consisting of a credit services instructions object, an inventory services instructions object, customer services instructions object, and an activations system instructions object. In analogous art, Star discloses another integrated processing system from a plurality of data systems wherein the first data system connection and the second data system connection are selected from the group consisting of a credit services system connection, an inventory services system connection, a customer services system connection, and an activations system connection and the plurality of data system instructions objects are selected from the group consisting of a credit services instructions object, an inventory services instructions object, customer services instructions object, and an activations system instructions object (pp. 3-4, ¶ 24; p. 5, ¶ 33). It would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Star with Fang to facilitate a small business with



Art Unit: 2143

the services required for managing the day-to-day financial transactions of the company as supported by Star (p. 1, ¶ 8).

13. Referring to claim 4, Fang discloses the invention substantively as described in claim 1. Fang does not specifically disclose the memory includes an accounting services instructions object. In analogous art, Star discloses another integrated processing system from a plurality of data systems wherein the memory includes an accounting services instructions object (pp. 3-4, ¶ 24). It would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Star with Fang to facilitate a small business with the services required for managing the day-to-day financial transactions of the company as supported by Star (p. 1, ¶ 8).

14. Claims 15, 17, 24, 28, and 32 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Claims 8, 10, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fang in view of Koenig et al. (USPN 6,101,198) (hereinafter Koenig).

15. Fang discloses the invention substantively as described in claim 1. Fang does not disclose having a second network connection being adapted to receive information sent from the terminal over the second network and also adapted to receive information sent to the terminal, wherein the second network is different from the first network.

Koenig discloses a computer terminal having a second network connection (i.e. another

Art Unit: 2143

Internet port, HTTP port) being adapted to receive information sent from the terminal over the second network and also adapted to receive information sent to the terminal, wherein the second network is different from the first network (e.g. abstract; Figure 4; col. 7, line 56 to col. 8, line 9). It would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Koenig with Fang to allow a redundant backup system in case a connection fails, thereby increasing customer service and reliability.

16. Claim 12 is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Claims 3, 11, 13, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fang in view of Cusack et al (US 2003/0120546) (hereinafter Cusack).

17. Referring to claim 3, Fang discloses the invention substantively as described in claim 1. Fang does not disclose a POS database coupled to the server and the memory includes a POS services instructions object. Cusack discloses another system for integrated processing of multiple data systems which includes a POS database (152; Figure 1B) and the memory includes a POS services instructions object (pp. 6-7 ¶ 57). It would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Cusack with Fang to provide viable real-time implementation of POS transactions without causing significant burdens to network

Art Unit: 2143

infrastructures or undue increases in infrastructure costs as supported by Cusack (pp. 1-2, ¶ 11).

18. Claims 11, 13, and 18, are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Claims 7 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fang in view of Porter (USPN 6,714,978).

19. Referring to claim 7, Fang discloses the invention substantively as described in claim 1. Fang does not disclose the plurality of data systems instructions objects are Java beans. Porter discloses another system of record transaction processing which shows data instructions objects as Java beans (col. 21, lines 1-2). It would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Porter with Fang because it would provide for reduced complexity of the system while allowing for the ease of future upgrades or replacements and software enhancements.

20. Claim 21 is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

### ***Conclusion***

21. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2143

22. Cacace-Bailey et al. (USPN 6,611,916) discloses a method of authenticating membership for providing access to a secure environment.

23. Nielsen (USPN 6,182,229) discloses a password helper using a client-side master password.

24. Fang et al. (USPN 6,240,512) discloses a SSO mechanism having master key synchronization.

25. Dutcher et al. (USPN 6,269,405) discloses a user account establishment and synchronization in heterogeneous networks.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph E. Avellino whose telephone number is (703) 305-7855. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:00-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on (703) 308-5221. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2143

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JEA  
May 26, 2004



DAVID WILEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100